DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 166 965 FL 010 071

AUTHOR Kreidler, Charles W.
TITLE Creating New Words by Shortening.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Interdisciplinary Conference on Linguistics (4th, Louisville, Kentucky, April 8, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Abbreviations; *American English; *English; Generative Phonology; Language Patterns; *Language Usage; Morphology (Languages); *Orthographic Symbols; Phonological Units; Semantics; Speech Habits; Syllables; *Vocabulary; Writing
IDENTIFIERS *Acronyms

ABSTRACT

The reduction of existing lexical items to shorter forms has generally been discussed under the headings of "acronyms," "back-formations," and "clippings." Two kinds of acronym are found, the letter-naming type (e.g. FBI, YMCA) and the letter-sounding type (e.g. UNESCO, CARE). The latter type must be pronounceable within the phonotactic norms of the language; thus it may coincide with an existing word, and sometimes the coincidence is favored for the semantic association. The term "back-formation" has been applied to instances in which an apparent suffix has been removed (e.g. edit from editor) and "clipping" to instances in which the matter removed is not a morpheme (e.g. gym from gymnasium). This paper suggests that such a distinction is not valid and uses the term "clipping" for both. Clipping occurs mainly because people like to play with language and because language has redundant matter which can be deleted. On the phonological side, certain preferences are seen: (1) the clipped form is more likely to be from the beginning of the source form than from the end or middle; (2) it falls into one of a small number of patterns; and (3) it shows all the phonological constraints which exist for longer words. Grammatically and semantically, various innovations are possible: the clipped form may be identical in meaning and function with the source form, it may be more restricted, or it may have a broader meaning and/or a wider grammatical function. (Author/AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles W. Kreidler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

ED166965

FL010071

CREATING NEW WORDS BY SHORTENING

Charles W. Kreidler

Georgetown University

Scholars who have dealt with English word-formation, historically or synchronically (e.g. Jespersen 1909-49, Koziol 1937, Francis 1963, Marchand 1969, Quirk et al. 1972, Adams 1973, Williams 1975), have all included some discussion of coining words by abbreviation, generally under the headings of acronyms, back-formations, and clippings (Jespersen's "stump words").(1) These topics, however, get comparatively brief treatment in the total account of morphology--Marchand, for example, devotes some 18 pages to them in a book of 370 pages, Adams 13 out of 218 pages--and the authors seem to be more concerned with giving examples of the products than with examining the processes. In this article I want to explore the ways in which bigger words become shortened and how the results resemble the source words--phonologically, grammatically, and semantically. The discussion is limited to English, but the processes discussed are by no means so limited.

In our daily use of language we produce and we process numerous utterances, many of them trite and hackneyed, no doubt, but many others are novel and fresh. Sentence production is, in general, a constant creation. New words come into existence much more rarely, and they come in a limited number of ways. They may come into existence by pure invention, but this is rare; kodak and nylon are the standard examples of words which seem to have sprung full-blown from the minds of their originators. More typically, new words are borrowed from another language or they are fashioned from elements already present in the language. Découpage and macramé will do as recent

examples of words which have been adopted from one language, French, and adapted to another language, English. Tattletape and whirlybird are fairly recent examples of words which represent new arrangements of existing morphemes. In between the pure borrowing and the new composition of existing material one may recognize another kind of neologism, words concocted from Latin and Greek elements, such as defenestration, vasoactive, helicopter, and psychedelic. But no strict separation of classical combinations and native combinations is possible, for Latin, Greek, Old French and native English often mix freely: agrobusiness, biodegradable, hyperactive, television, etc.

When words are created by composition, it seems generally to be for the purpose of naming new phenomena, as in the case of helicopter, alias whirlybird, or agrobusiness. When words are created by decomposition, by shortening, it is often a matter of finding a new designation for some phenomena or concept which already has a name (for example, copter from helicopter, agrobiz from agrobusiness), but many times the new name comes to have a meaning of its own.

Words may be made by decomposition and composition--the so-called blends, of which motel (motor + hotel), brunch (breakfast + lunch), and smog (smoke + fog) are well-known examples. I consider blends to be multiple clippings and will not discuss them separately here. The various kinds of word-shortening are intermixed in actual usage; radar is an acronym (radio detection and ranging); lidar is a blend of light and

radar
~~radar~~--a blend of a word and an acronym; quasar (quasi-stellar) is a blend of two clippings; pulsar (pulse + quasar) blends a word with a clipping. But are these classifications really important? One suspects that any lexical novelty is likely to influence the formation of others, but in various ways. In the paragraphs that follow I discuss acronyms, back-formations, and clippings, especially the last, and I suggest that the distinction between back-formation and clipping is not an essential one.

An acronym is a word which is devised from the written form of a lexical construction. A construction, by definition, consists of more than one morpheme; a written construction consists, usually, of more than one written word; an acronym is formed from the first letter or letters of each major word--but see below. There are two types of acronyms, the kind like USA, FBI, ICBM, in which one recites the first letter of ~~of~~ each major word in the construction or major morpheme, as in the case of Inter-continental Ballistic Missile, and the type like UNESCO, NATO, HUD, in which one "sounds out" the initial letters or a little bit more. Both kinds are based on writing but influenced by speech; they do not make contrastive use of capital and small letters (e.g. FBI vs. fbi) nor of punctuation marks (FBI vs. F.B.I., for instance), much less different kinds of type, since such visual contrasts do not translate into speech differences.

The letter-recitation type of acronym, as has been said, contains one letter for each major word in the construction, but there is no absolute determination of what a major word is, and there are a few instances of

two letters occurring for a single word, like tb (alternatively, t.b., TB, or T.B.) for tuberculosis, ID for identification, and TV for television. Such acronyms are pronounced with maximum stress on the last letter-name (VD, ROTC, YMCA). There are no constraints on what letters may co-occur, even repetitions of the same letter being permitted: AAUP, IWW, etc. The only constraint would seem to be in length, most such acronyms containing between two and five letters. (Six-letter acronyms like SPBQSA, the Society for the Preservation of Barbershop Quartet Singing in America, are facetious.) Repeated letters may be vocalized with the words double or triple: Triple-A for the American Automobile Association and other organizations, N-double-A-C-P for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, I-double-O-F for the International Organization of Odd Fellows. The pronounced acronym is thus phonologically rather remote, in many instances, from what one would say in the long form. The fact that some acronyms are based on Latin (a.m., p.m., M.D., Ph.D.) contributes to the phonological distance between acronym and usual equivalent, as do the vagaries of English spelling (compare a.k.a for also known as).

The letter-sounding type of acronym has to conform to the phonotactic norms of the language. So, for example, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, which could be just S-N-C-C in one type of acronym, becomes, in the other type of acronym, [snɪk] with the two C's reduced to one value, [k], and a vowel imported. One may ask why this particular vowel, and where did it come from? When R-O-T-C, for the Reserve Officers Training Corps, is

translated into the letter-sounding type of acronym, it may be realized as [rótəsi] or [rátsi], which suggests that there is considerable freedom as to what vowel sound is added and whether or not a vowel sound is added. Little words like of and in, especially the former, may be used to feed in vowels when these are needed, or they may be ignored when no such need exists; the Congress of Racial Equality becomes not CRE but CORE, which is not only pronounceable but an existing word; The Department of Transportation is DOT; the Test of English as a Foreign Language becomes TOEFL [tófəl] | [tófəl] because TEFL [téfəl] already means Teaching English as a Foreign Language, | [téfəl] a contrasting but obviously related designation. Various portions of the source term may be included in the acronym; witness AMESLAN [ǽməslæ̀n] for American Sign Language; CREEP for the infamous Committee to Re-elect the President; such bureaucratic designations as the Navy's AdComSubLant for Administrative Command, Submarine Forces, Atlantic Fleet; such trade names as Panagra, Socony, and Texaco; and such geographical names as Delmarva and Texarkana. In many obvious cases the acronym does not just result from an established name; rather, the source term is chosen in order to lead to a particular acronym, not merely pronounceable but in some way significant. It is hard to imagine, for example, that the name Women Appointed for Volunteer Emergency Service, originating in World War II, was chosen for any purpose other than to yield WAVES, or that the term Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe could have been selected except to lead to a more frequent appelation, CARE. In summary, acronyms | [ǽməslæ̀n]

of the type we have called letter-sounding must be pronounceable within the existing canons of pronounceability; being pronounceable they may coincide with existing words, and sometimes such a coincidence is favored for the semantic association. Acronyms are secondary designations, inasmuch as an acronym must be derived from a more primitive name or term, but the acronym may well out-perform and out-last its source.

The term back formation has been devised to refer to obvious historical instances of one kind of shortening. The nouns editor, scavenger, sculptor existed first; the verbs edit, scavenge, sculpt were created by cutting away an apparent suffix. In our own times we have seen the same process applied to give us babysit from babysitter and buttle from butler. Similarly, in Middle English the mass nouns pease and cherise were interpreted as plural forms and new singular forms, pea and cherry, came into existence. Back formation is, then, the opposite of composition in a way, but it is like composition as a process which confirms the existence of a paradigm, inflectional or derivational, and adds a new item to that paradigm. It should be noted, however, that new constructions come into existence without anything ever being cut away; on the model of marathon, presumably, we have phon-athon, sell-athon, walk-athon; cavalcade leads to motorcade; Watergate is responsible, lexically, for Koreagate. Elements like -athon, -cade, and -gate (with the meaning "political scandal") are what Wheeler (1978) has aptly termed "as if" morphemes.

In the usual treatments of word-formation the term back formation is

used for instances, like those just cited, in which the material removed has obvious status as a morpheme, and the term clipping refers to subtraction of material which is not obviously morphemic, as when gymnasium is reduced to gym or telephone to phone. This distinction is not always so evident, however; does the verb enthuse come from enthusiasm or enthusiast, and in either case is the part removed a morpheme? There is a verb liaise formed from liaison; what is the status of the portion cut off? Adams (1973: 135) restricts the term clipping to "the process by which a word of two or more syllables (usually a noun) is shortened without a change in its function taking place," but, as will be shown below, there are numerous instances of functional change, grammatical and semantic, which accompany the removal of phonic (and graphic) matter that has no morphemic status.

Marchand (1969: 364-5) points out that, though examples of clipping can be found from Shakespeare's time on, the phenomenon is a modern one, favored by the "headline style of newspapers with its craving for short words." Whatever the favoring factor(s) may be, no one can help noticing the frequency of clipped forms today. We hear about a disco, a pop concert, a lube job; we hear something described as delish or fab or marvy. You may recall the first time you encountered one or more such abbreviated form. Perhaps you heard a weather report on the radio which included the news that the chance of precip [prisˈɪp] was near zero for that day, and you understood immediately. We can recognize three factors involved when a new clipped form is launched and is accepted as the equivalent

of its source word. First, the short form has to resemble its source in some fairly unambiguous way. Second, the abbreviated form appears in a context, linguistic and/or pragmatic, in which the source word is customary and therefore in some sense anticipated. Finally, there is the fact that we are used to this phenomenon in our use of language. The process of clipping is not a one-time event, nor is it haphazard. It is accomplished by certain processes which are familiar to speaker and hearer (or writer and reader).

The fact that there are processes is important, for many clipped forms must be ephemeral or local (Trib for a particular newspaper, Met for a certain theater, Caps for a hockey team) or otherwise specialized (Generally only garage men refer to shock absorbers as shocks). The products of the processes do not have to be learned one by one. The process of clipping is applied, obviously, to specific lexical items but it must be related to more general processes in the language which also yield shortened utterances. There are, for instance, phonological processes which result in the "slurred" pronunciation of sentences and formulas in frequent use: [gmɔ́rn̩n̩] as a rendition of Good morning, [weḿɪn] for Wait a minute, or the store clerk's [mə ɛ́lpyu] for May I help you?. This kind of shortening is utterance-specific. There is another kind of phonic abbreviation which may be called context-specific, the deletion of one or more segments in a particular kind of environment. For example, a three-syllable pronunciation of family, history, memory, salary, alternates, with many of us, with a two-syllable pronunciation of the same words. The shorter forms are derived from the longer by a single rule—

roughly, delete an unstressed vowel in a posttonic syllable which is itself followed by an unstressed syllable (see Zwicky 1972 for a more precise description of this rule, Kypriotaki 1970 for description of another context-specific process, loss of initial unstressed syllables). Some historical clippings (e.g. bet, cute, fend, still from abet, acute, defend, distill, respectively) may well have come about from such a phonological process, but to understand the phenomenon of clipping we need to look farther.

Another kind of shortening process, syntactic in nature, called ellipsis, applies to specific construction types. This appears to be more relevant for our investigation. One such instance of ellipsis deletes a noun after a modifying adjective or noun, mostly when the head noun is a generic term and the modifier is specific. Thus, in I'd like some of the Spanish., the reference may be to Spanish onions, Spanish peanuts, Spanish wine, or whatever. When the ellipted noun is plural and the modifier does not end in a sibilant consonant, the sign of plurality may move forward; so Bermudas equals Bermuda onions or Bermuda shorts, finals may mean final examinations, primaries can refer to primary elections, and so on.

All these elliptic forms contain more information than they display. The full meanings are in the underlying source forms, the deep structures, which are recoverable from context. It sometimes happens, however, that the head noun becomes lost entirely and the original modifier takes on the meaning of the whole phrase. Who remembers now that a corsage was originally a corsage (i.e., body) flower, or that a brownstone was once a brownstone front

house? In similar fashion adjectives like capital, periodical, private, principal, and variable have been promoted to the status of nouns by deletion of something following.

After a phrase or compound undergoes ellipsis, the result may in turn undergo clipping. Sometimes the path seems obvious: a permanent wave becomes, in some people's English, a permanent, which becomes, in other people's English, a perm. In other instances the derivation is not so clear: pub comes from public house, but was there an intermediate stage? And if so, what was it? Or does it matter? One thing is certain: the greater the amount of phonic deletion, the greater the semantic load which is borne by what remains. We return to this theme below.

Why does clipping occur? Because people like to play with language, and clipping is apparently as pleasurable as punning, rhyming, alliteration, and the like. Perhaps also because there is pleasure in fashion, prestige in being able to recognize and use linguistic novelties. First of all, though, because it is possible; language has redundancy, and some redundant material can be removed without impeding communication.

Loss of redundancy leads to loss of contrastiveness. The words laboratory and liberation are quite different; lab and lib are quite similar. Homophony, complete loss of contrast, is common in clipped forms: ad, depending on context, can stand for administration or advertisement; sub does duty for submarine or substitute; vet means veteran or veterinarian. So, too, a clipped form may coincide with an existing word: bells now means bellbottom trousers in addition

to things that ring; *coke* can mean *cocaine*, and a *tempo* may be a *temporary building*; and *nark*, the clipped form of *narcotics agent* is identical with an earlier word, of Australian origin, meaning 'an annoying person' and with a British slang term, of Romany origin, for 'a police informer' (Random House Unabridged Dictionary, *s.v.*).

Though I have called clipping a process, it would be audacious to suggest that the process is simple and straightforward, something which can be stated in an uncomplicated rule. Nobody can predict what terms are likely to be so shortened nor how the shortened forms will "catch on" and spread. Nor can the precise shape of the shortening be predicted, where the cut will be made, how much retained, how much discarded. However, investigation shows that some possibilities are greater than others. There are various probabilities when big words are creatively shortened.

Previous treatments of the topic have noted that most clipped forms come from the initial part of their source words, some from the final portion, and a few from the middle. Actually, I know of only two examples in which the clipping derives from the middle: flu from influenza and fridge from refrigerator. Adams (1973, p. 136) also cites script for prescription; I suspect this is as unfamiliar to most Americans as it is to me. As for those which come from the end of their respective source words, there is a goodly number of historical clippings to record: (a)bet, (violin)cello, (rac)coon, (a)cute, (de)fence, (de)fend, (en)gin(e), (a)mend, (ap)ply, (o)possum, (de)spite, (di)sport, (e)spy, (di)still, (hi)story, (e)strange, (at)tend, (cara)van, (ad)venture, (peri)wig. The only recent examples I have come across are: (ham)burger, (arti)choke, (heli)copter, (an)droid, (canta)lope, (chrysanthe)mum, (tele)phone, and (air)plane. All others that can be dealt with here come from the initial part of the source word.

Generally the clipped form is, as one would expect, a prominent part of the source word, but it is not necessarily from the portion which has maximum stress in the source word. It may come from a part of the word which has middle stress (Trager and Smith's tertiary stress, here indicated by the grave accent mark), as in lìb(erátion), màth(emátics), (héli)còpter, (téle)phòne.

Most clipped forms are one syllable long: bach, lab, lib, prog, ump, vet, and many more that have been mentioned or will be mentioned below. Clipped forms of two or three syllables fall into four types. (There are none that I know of which have more than three syllables, and even the three-syllable ones are not common.). First, there is the type which has a final vowel [i], orthographically -y, -i, or -ie. This final vowel may be part of the source word or an addition to it; no distinction is made here. Examples:

alky	(alcoholic addict)
Aussie	(Australian)
benny	(benzedrine tablet)
Caddy/ -ie	(Cadillac)
carny	(carnival worker)
Chevy	(Chevrolet)
Cincy	(Cincinnati)
civvies	(civilian clothes)
comfy	(comfortable)

commie/ C-	(communist)
deli	(delicatessen)
divvy	(dividend)
hanky	(handkerchief)
Indy	(the Indianapolis Speedway)
juvie, juvey	(juvenile delinquent)
marvy	(marvelous)
middy	(midshipman)
movie	(moving picture)
nightie	(nightgown)
Okie	(Oklahoman, especially a migrant from that state in the 1930's)
Philly	(Philadelphia)
preemie	(premature baby)
telly [Br.]	(television)
undies	(underclothes).

A bit less common is the type which ends with a vowel [o], either as a portion of the original term or as an addition:

aggro [Br.]	(aggressiveness)
ammo	(ammunition)
anthro	(anthropology)
combo	(combination)
demo	(demonstration [model], [political] demonstration)

disco	(discotheque)
hippo	(hippopotamus)
intro	(introduction)
limo	(limousine)
mayo	(mayonnaise)
memo	(memorandum)
mimeo	(mimeograph)
mono	(mononucleosis)
photo	(photograph)
polio	(poliomyelitis)
promo	(promotion)
rhino	(rhinoceros)
slomo	(slow-motion replay)
stereo	(stereophonic system)
tempo	(temporary building).

Then there is a type of clipped form with stress on the second syllable (of two) or third (of three): binocs (= binoculars), delish (= delicious), exam (= examination), exec (= executive officer), legit (= legitimate), photog (= photographer), the British matric (= matriculation), and the military term attrit, which is defined this way in The Barnhart Dictionary of New English since 1963: "to wear down by attrition; weaken by harrassment or abuse." The fourth type of polysyllabic clipping has primary stress

on the first syllable and middle stress on the second syllable (of two) or third (of three):

ádvèrt [Br.]	(advertisement)
có-èd	(female student in a co-educational institution)
có-òp	(co-operative association)
écòn	(economics)
íntercòm	(intercommunication system)
nóncòm	(noncommissioned officer)
préfàb	(prefabricated structure)
récàp	(recapitulation)
réhàb	(rehabilitation).

At least some of these were previously pronounced with primary stress on the end syllable (e.g., advért, co-éd), and it is perhaps significant that what I first heard as precíp I have since heard several times rendered as précìp.

Most clipped forms are from the initial portion of the source word and most are one syllable long. Moreover, most of these end with a consonant. Exceptions are rare: the flu which was mentioned before and pro, for professional, which, if it preserved the following consonant, might not be distinct from prof, for professor. Almost always, then, when the source word contains one consonant between its first vowel and its second vowel, the clipped form contains that consonant--the cut is made after that intervocalic consonant. Examples: beaut(y), bod(y), chem(istry), cig(aret),

[also ciggy/ciggie], cuc(umber) [orthographically cuke], fed(eral), fem(inine), frat(ernity), Ja[illegible]anese), lab(oratory), lib(eration) [= lib(eral], math(ematics) [maths in British use], med(ical) [= med(icine)], mod(ern), pen(itentiary), prep(aratory), prof(essor), prom(enade), ref(eree), sec(ond), stup(id) [orthographically stupe], triq(onometry), veq(etable); with a plural sign attached: caps for "capital letters," knucks for "knuckles," mocs for "mocassins."

When the source word has a sequence of two consonants between its first and second vowels, the clipped form preserves both consonants or only the first of them, depending on their relative sonority. Generally liquids (l, r) and glides (y, w) are more sonorant than nasals (m, n), and nasals are more sonorant than obstruents (stops and fricatives). When the sequence of consonants is such that a more sonorant consonant precedes a less sonorant one, both consonants are preserved in the clipped form. When the second consonant is less sonorant than the first one, or when the two consonants are of the same degree of sonority, only the first consonant appears in the clipped form. When the second consonant is less sonorant thatn the first one, or when the two consonants are of the same degree of sonority, only the first is retained in the clipped form. Let's examine the specific cases:

Liquid followed by nasal: dorm(itory), perm(anent), porn(ography). Liquid followed by obstruent: narc(otics agent) [orthographically also nark], perc(olate) [orthographically perk], serq(eant) [orthographically sarge], tarp(aulin), turp(entine). In all these examples the liquid is r; I have

found only one example of l as first member of the cluster: talc(um). Nasal followed by obstruent: bronc(o), quint(uplet), simp(leton), ump(ire), vamp(ire). But the phonological constraints of English have to be observed. When a non-permitted final cluster would occur, there is a different treatment. Both convict and confidence (in the phrase confidence artist) are clipped to con. English has no final sequence of -nv or -nf, so that neither *conv nor *conf would be a possible word. We may note, too, that combo (from combination) must have an added vowel because the consonant cluster mb does not occur finally in modern English. I have found only one instance of a source word with nasal + obstruent whose clipped form retains the nasal but loses the obstruent: benny from benzedrine pill.

Obstruent followed by nasal--the nasal is not retained: ad(ministration), sub(marine), tech(nological institute). Obstruent followed by liquid: lub(ricate) [orthographically lube], Met(ropolitan), mic(rophone) [orthographically mike], nuc(lear weapon) [orthographically nuke], prog(ress), pub(lic house), quad(rangle), rec(reation), synch(ronization), vib(ration)s [orthographically vibes]. There is nothing suprising, of course, about the fact that the nasal or liquid consonant is dropped since such sequences as dm or br do not occur in final position in English words.

Obstruent followed by glide: I have found only one instance of a clipped form in which the cut has been made between an obstruent and a following [w], perks for perquisites. Examples of obstruent and a following [y] (which is itself followed by the vowel [u]) are more common: fab(ulous), pop(ular), reg(ulation)s, rep(utation), Trib(une), vac(uum).

When [y] is lost after [d], palatalization does not occur. Thus we have grad--and not graj- for graduate, and similarly phys ed for physical education, sked for schedule. Some might prefer to describe this in the framework of generative phonology and say that deletion of the abstract, underlying segments following d occurs before a palatalization rule can take effect. Others would say that the clipping is influenced by orthography: the letters following d are cut away and the resulting stump-words are given the pronunciation one would expect. The two modes of describing are of course not irreconcilable. We should note that the clipped forms of sociology, sergeant, refrigerator, and naturally--soash, sarge, fridge, and natch, respectively--have palatal consonants in final position.

Nasal followed by nasal: gym(nasium) is the only example I have. Examples of obstruent followed by obstruent are numerous: ad(vertisement), cap(tain), doc(tor), op(tic art), pec(toral muscle)s, sis(ter), spec(tacle)s, strep(tococcus). In each case the first obstruent is retained, the second cut away. It should be noted that such possible forms as capt and doct would be pronounceable within the general rules for permitted sequences of consonants in English. But in the process of clipping there seems to be a tendency to reduce to just one obstruent in final position, yielding forms which require less effort to pronounce.

On the phonological side, then, the process of clipping exhibits certain preferences: the short form is more likely to be from the beginning of the source word than from the end, and more likely to be from the end than from the middle; the clipped form is likely to be one syllable long,

or if longer to fall into one of a very small number of patterns. If monosyllabic, it is almost certain to end with one consonant; if it ends with two consonants, the first is more sonorant than the second. The clipped form shows all the phonological constraints which exist for longer words in the language; in fact, clipped forms are somewhat on the conservative side.

If, now, we turn to the grammatical and semantic aspects of this shortening process, we find considerably more variety among the products of the process. In some cases the clipped form is essentially identical in meaning and range of use with the source form; gym does not differ appreciably from gymnasium, and I see no difference between a ref and a referee; mono means the same as mononucleosis, polio the same as poliomyelitis. In other cases, however, the clipped form is more restricted in occurrence and/or in meaning than the word from which it is derived. In still other cases the shorter form has taken on wider use and additional meanings--in a few cases to the point of being no longer identical with the word from whence it came.

Restrictions first. The word confidence has been shortened to con, but only in a few set phrases like con artist, con game; con does not replace confidence in the full range of that word's occurrences. Similarly, knucks stands for knuckles but only after brass; lieutenant is shortened to looey, but only when first or second precedes; op stands for optic but only in the term op art, and for opposite in the strange new name, op ed, the page of a newspaper opposite the editorial page, which features articles by columnists; pop means popular but occurs only in pop art, pop culture,

perhaps a few others; prog does duty for progress in the term prog report, but does the clipped form occur otherwise? A recreation room becomes a rec room, but recreation is not reduced in any other context; synchronization becomes synch in the phrases in synch and out of synch but not much more.

There are other less specific kinds of restriction. The word beauty, for instance, can be an abstract non-countable noun or a concrete countable one; beaut, as in She's a beaut is only a concrete countable. Combo is from combination but only as a combination of musicians. Similarly, vibes refers to musical or mystical vibrations transmitted by some congenial person, place, or event, but hardly to the vibrations of a freight train passing close by. Vamp, a word of the 1920's, meant vampire, but only in the secondary sense of "seductive woman," not in the original sense of "blood-sucking nocturnal wanderer from the grave." The word second is an ordinal number and also a unit of time; the clipped form sec has only the latter meaning. Captain, doctor, and sister can be shortened to cap, doc, and sis, respectively, but only, I think, as vocatives--rather irreverent vocatives, in fact. More examples of such restrictions can easily be found.

The clipped form may, on the other hand, show an expansion in the use or the meaning of the form from which it is derived. Consider, first, the expansion of part-of-speech. Divvy comes from the noun dividend, yet it is used both as noun (a divvy) and as verb (to divvy up). Similarly the word lube is both noun and verb; does it come from both lubrication and lubricate, or just one of them with later expansion of the clipped form?

Whatever the answer, we may note that recap means both recapitulate and recapitulation and that rehab means rehabilitate and rehabilitation. Sometimes the part of speech does not expand but simply changes. The words bachelor, psychology, rapport, and revolution are nouns; from them come, respectively, the verbs to bach it, to psych out, to rap, and to rev up. And we should add here that long, long ago the name Canterbury was responsible for the shorter verb to canter. The adjective uncouth, as in to be uncouth, has strangely, upon shortening, become a noun, to have (or not have) couth, and the adjective stupid has likewise yielded a new noun, stupe. The other way around, from the noun cushion comes the adjective cushy. I suppose, too, one might say that strep, as in strep throat, is an adjective derived from the noun streptococcus.

The clipped form sometimes has a meaning rather different from that of the original word. Often the meaning difference is affective rather than in denotation and accordingly hard to define. Such words as hankie, undies, nightie, jammies have a meaning that might be vaguely defined as "cuteness" in addition to their straightforward denotations. Perhaps the same is true for such nouns as bod for body, mag for magazine, mayo for mayonnaise, prez for president and for adjectives like comfy, delish, fab, looney, and marvy (respectively, comfortable, delicious, fabulous, lunatic, marvelous). There is certainly an affective meaning in such proper names as Philly, Cincy, Frisco, and Chi and in such names as Caddy, Chevy, or Jag. Names for groups of people, such as Jap or Mex, Aussie or Okie, may carry strong

attitudinal meanings, reflecting whatever viewpoint the speaker has.

Occasionally the clipped form has become semantically separated from its source word, as standard discussions of this topic invariably point out. A van is not now a caravan, a sports fan is not necessarily a fanatic, a whiz is not really a wizard, and nobody who attends a senior prom nowadays will be likely to see a promenade. It is not necessarily the clipped form which shows a change of meaning; the adjective mod apparently encapsulated, a few years ago, somebody's idea of what was modern; but the meaning of modern is always changing; the word mod is now somewhat passé.

Finally, we have clipped forms which contain an added semantic feature because, apparently, they come from a phrase or compound through the processes of ellipsis and clipping together. The word alky, for instance, obviously comes from alcoholic, but the semantic source is something like alcoholic addict (and not, for instance, alcoholic beverage); coed derives from coeducation(al), but the meaning suggests that there was at some time a term like coeducational student, with an implicit semantic feature "feminine." I have a list of such clipped forms which derive, semantically at least, from compounds or phrases and which contain more meaning than they display:

caps	(capital letters)
carnie	(carnival worker)
civvies	(civilian clothes)
comp	(comprehensive examination)

co-op	(co-operative association)
demo	(demonstration model)
fed	(federal government employee)
intercom	(intercommunication system)
juvie	(juvenile delinquent)
nark	(narcotics agent)
non-com	(non-commissioned officer)
nuke	(nuclear weapon)
parkie (Br.)	(park-keeper)
pecs	(pectoral muscles)
perm	(permanent wave)
preemie	(premature baby)
prefab	(prefabricated building)
premed	(premedical student)
pub	(public house)
slomo	(slow-motion replay)
tempo	(temporary building)
typo	(typographical error).

In short, the forms in my data show a rather rigid conformation to phonological norms; the ways these forms are used are innovative, unpredictable, creative.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Valerie (1973) An Introduction to Modern English Word-Formation, London

Barnhart, Clarence L., Sol Steinmetz, and Robert K. Barnhart (1973) The Barnhart Dictionary of New English since 1963, Bronxville, NY

Francis, W. Nelson (1963) The English Language, New York

Halliday, M.A.K., and Ruqaiya Hasan (1975) Cohesion in English, London

Heller, Louis G., and James Macris (1968) "A Typology of Shortening Devices," American Speech 43.201-208

Jespersen, O. J. (1909-49) A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles, London and Copenhagen

Koziol, H. (1937) Handbuch der Englischen Wortbildungslehre, Heidelberg

Kypriotaki, Lyn (1970) "Aphaeresis in Rapid Speech," American Speech 45.69-77

Marchand, Hans (1969) The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation, 2nd ed., University, AL

Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik (1972) A Grammar of Contemporary English, London and New York

Wheeler, Cathy (1978) " 'As-if' Morphemes in the Formation of New English Words," paper presented at the Fourth Annual Meeting, Interdisciplinary Conference on Linguistics, University of Louisville, April 7-8

Williams, Joseph M. (1975) Origins of the English Language, New York

Zwicky, Arnold M. (1972) "Note on a Phonological Hierarchy in English," in Robert P. Stockwell and R. K. S. Macauley, eds., Linguistic Change and Generative Theory, Bloomington, IN

FOOTNOTE

[1] Earlier, partial versions of this paper were read at the Southeast Conference on Linguistics, University of North Carolina at Greenville, April 1977, and at the Fourth Interdisciplinary Conference on Linguistics, University of Louisville, April 1978. For valuable comments I am indebted to people too numerous to count, much less name. For invaluable help I am especially grateful to my colleague, Donna Jo Napoli.